

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

General Information on the GKG Performance Monitoring Plan



Prepared for the United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
Regional Center for Southern Africa (RCSA) under Contract Number PCE-I-00-99-
00002-00 Task Order #811



This Technical Report was completed through the assistance of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The views expressed and opinions contained in this report are those of the author and are not intended as statements of policy of either USAID or the author's parent companies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of contents	III
1. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE GKG PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN	1
1.1 <i>Preparation of the PMP.....</i>	<i>1</i>
1.2 <i>Particular Characteristics of the GIG TBNTM Initiative.....</i>	<i>1</i>
1.3 <i>Description of the Principal GKG Partners</i>	<i>2</i>
1.4 <i>Vision for the Future Beyond GKG.....</i>	<i>2</i>
2. DETAILS OF THE GKG PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN	4
2.1 <i>Explanation of the Indicator Tables (Annex B).....</i>	<i>4</i>
2.2 <i>Discussion of the “Engagement Index”.....</i>	<i>5</i>
2.3 <i>Explanation of Annex C – Strategic Refocusing Matrix.....</i>	<i>6</i>
2.4 <i>Reporting</i>	<i>6</i>
ANNEX A: GKG RESULTS FRAMEWORK.....	7
ANNEX B: GKG TABLES OF INDICATORS AND TARGETS.....	9
ANNEX C: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN STRATEGIC REFOCUSING MATRIX.....	21
<i>Concept:.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Key Activity Characteristics:.....</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Scoring:</i>	<i>23</i>
<i>Evaluation:.....</i>	<i>23</i>

1. GENERAL INFORMATION ON THE GKG PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

The purpose of the Initiative for the Management of the Gaza-Kruger-Gonarezhou (GKG) Transboundary Natural Resources Management Area (TBNRMA) **is to provide technical assistance for the initiation and implementation of activities resulting in the increased collaboration among the three constituent countries in the sustainable management of the shared resources in the TBNRMA for the social and economic development of the communities in the area.**

The GKG Initiative supports the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Regional Center for Southern Africa (RCSA) in its efforts “to assist southern African nations and communities collaborate to manage the unique bio-diversity that underpins the economic and social development of the region.” The Initiative has four intermediate results that guide the implementation of its fieldwork:

1. *Viable practices for the sustainable management of shared resources are adopted* – providing technical assistance for the development of approaches for establishing the TBNRMA, documentation and dissemination of new approaches including community-based ventures, joint venture partnerships, investment opportunities for increasing income and appropriate management planning and monitoring systems;
2. *Policies, protocols and agreements enacted* – providing technical assistance for identifying policy impediments to the TBNRMA’s development and suggesting specific policy instruments to remove these impediments;
3. *Organizations and institutions capable of effective regional intervention* – strengthening regional and local capacity to manage effectively the TBNRMA on a sustainable basis; and
4. *Ecological monitoring systems for decision-making are improved* - providing technical assistance to Identify and improve current systems for monitoring the ecological, social and economic performance of the TBNRMA and to institutionalize those systems at the local, sub-regional, national and regional levels.

The GKG TBNRMA encompasses 99,800 km² in southwestern Mozambique, northeastern South Africa and southeastern Zimbabwe. It includes national parks, provincial reserves, communal lands and private game reserves over a vast area already recognized for its ecological importance and strong tourism potential. The GKG Initiative will encourage community groups to interact effectively with public and private sector entities so as to derive real economic and social benefits for resource use and management.

1.1 Preparation of the PMP

The GKG activity Performance Monitoring Plan was initially outlined within the proposal that resulted in the original Task Order. Subsequently, Mr. Mike Godfrey, from DAI’s home office staff, provided short term TA to the COP and project staff to elaborate a full and detailed performance monitoring plan. This work was informed largely by the recently approved Supplemental Work Plan, the detailed activity documents and discussions with staff in Nelspruit and Maputo.

The draft PMP was discussed at length with the Strategic Objective 12 technical team at the RCSA offices in Gabarone. Subsequent discussions were held during the same visit with Mr. Norman Olsen and the Aurora technical team that is implementing the RCSA Impact activity. These consecutive discussions allowed the GKG team to refine and complete the proposed indicator set. The findings and comments from those discussions are represented in the PMP that follows.

1.2 Particular Characteristics of the GKG TBNTM Initiative

The Gaza-Kruger-Gonarezhou (GKG) Transboundary Natural Resources Management Initiative is unique in several ways that has made completing an appropriate PMP a more complicated challenge.

- The scope of activities covers three countries with the bulk planned for simultaneous, or joint implementation in all three;
- GKG is largely an institution building and policy harmonization effort that depends to a very high degree on the motivation and engagement of the main national and local institutional partners;
- The time frame of the activity is only 30 months;
- The project represents a continuation of longstanding RCSA natural resources management investments and programming.

This last element is of particular importance. The GKG activity is only the most recent USAID-funded activity in the SADC region that supports the overall strategic objective of “increasing regional cooperation in the management of shared natural resources.” NRMP, CAMPFIRE, RAPID, STRENGTH, and LIFE have already laid the basis within the region for some of the activities leading to and included in the GKG activity. That experience has been valuable in designing the activity and in preparing a more focused PMP.

These factors combine to limit, or focus, the proposed activity set that may be applied to reaching the RCSA mandated Intermediate Results. Additionally, these same factors impose constraints on the kind of indicators and monitoring approaches used to track them. The important elements of these are discussed in the next chapter - Details of the GKG Performance Monitoring Plan.

1.3 Description of the Principal GKG Partners

The GKG activity deals directly with local counterpart, or partner, institutions at three distinct levels.

The first tier of partners is formed by the national level implementing agencies – these are the various ministries and relevant departments in each of the three countries and, where existing, any national institution charged with intervening in the TFCA – South Africa National Parks, for example.

The second tier of partners are the sub-regional governments that fall within the zone. These include six provinces and at least five districts. This second group will eventually include the proposed Joint Management Board for the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP). This body, once created upon Treaty signature, will have the management authority across the jurisdiction of the GLTP but will be subordinate to the national agencies themselves.

The third tier includes the “extra-governmental” organizations, those not formally part of the local and national governments. It includes the full private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) as well as academia. There are very many of these institutions both interested in and ultimately responsible for parts of a successful GKG initiative.

The GKG Supplemental Work Plan and this PMP therefore contain frequent reference to these partners across all of the activities and monitoring instruments.

1.4 Vision for the Future Beyond GKG

It is frequently useful for a project to describe its vision towards which it is working – the “end state” that would signify a successful conclusion to the work of the project, associated partners and, perhaps, other donor activity in the same field. Discussion of that vision has helped to frame better some of the Intermediate Results, sub-results and specific activities for the GKG project. Its vision is:

A successful transnational park – the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park – being effectively managed by strengthened national conservation and park management agencies, with the active engagement of the sub-regional authorities, private sector, and local organizations, all working for the sustainable economic development of the communities within the larger Transfrontier Conservation Area.

Admittedly, this is a vision that is well off in the future. Certainly, it is beyond the allocated time for GKG implementation. However, this provides a useful framework within which the activities of the initiative (and external partners as well) can be guided more purposely towards their aims and to assist greatly with the prioritization of tasks and the allocation of scarce resources.

2. DETAILS OF THE GKG PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN

The performance monitoring plan designed for the GKG initiative is presented in summary narrative form here. The full details are included in Annexes A and B.

Annex A shows the highest level framework for the project as it fits within the USAID RCSA results package. Briefly, USAID is looking at one strategic objective for the environment sector with the following associated indicators:

USAID SO 12: Increased Regional Cooperation in the Management of Shared Natural Resources

Indicators:

Indicator #1 - Number of TBNRMA agreements established with RCSA support

Indicator #2 - Progress towards the ratification of selected environmental protocols

Indicator #3 - Progress towards the ratification of selected wildlife protocols

Indicator #4 - Number of countries where viable practices applied in targeted TBNRMA's (GKG management Plans)

Indicator #5 - Number of countries where viable practices applied in targeted TBNRMA's (Okavango monitoring)

Indicator Description:

Indicator #1 - Transboundary agreements where RCSA has had direct and substantial input

Indicator #2 - Progress = consultations initiated, protocol drafted, protocol signed, protocol ratified

Indicator #3 - Progress = consultations initiated, protocol drafted, protocol signed, protocol ratified

Indicator #4 - Practices = CBNRM monitoring systems and management plans, community/NGO/private sector partnership, and increased stakeholder participation

Indicator #5 - Practices = same as # 4

USAID RCSA maintains the full set of documentation on the details and linkages of this set of intermediate results as it relates to all of its programs. The GKG Project is only one component. The Diagram in Annex B shows the summarized Sub-Results packages for the GKG Initiative as they each relate to the SO.

2.1 Explanation of the Indicator Tables (Annex B)

The full PMP for the activity is included in the eight tables in Annex B. The indicator set, targets, and reporting approach are outlined against each of the four established Intermediate Results for the USAID SO:

IR 12.1 Viable practices for sustainable management of shared natural resources adopted

IR 12.2 Policies, protocols and agreements enacted to support TBNRM

IR 12.3 Organizations and institutions capable of effective regional intervention

IR 12.4 Ecological monitoring systems for improved NRM decision-making

Each IR's table spans two separate sheets that are logically joined together with the first table at the top and the second at the bottom. The top row of the second sheet is a reiteration of the performance indicators carried down from above for convenience to the reader. The tables are organized as follows:

Table ____ Intermediate Result 12. ____

Performance Indicator	Statement of expected outcome(s)
Indicator Definition	<i>Further definition of the outcome(s)</i>
Unit of Measurement	<i>The precise count or reporting of those outcome(s)</i>
Data Source	<i>Where the data will be found or secured (GKG project)</i>
Method/Approach of Data Collection	<i>How the information is likely to be acquired</i>
Schedule/Frequency	<i>Proposed frequency of data review (usually quarterly)</i>
Reporting	<i>Proposed frequency (usually quarterly)</i>
End-users	<i>Those served by the task, or reporting on activity</i>
Target	<i>Numerical targets proposed for each task</i>
Baseline Data	<i>Status of task at start of project</i>
Phase 1 (USG FY 01 – 6 months) Target	<i>Proposed calendar for achieving/reporting the outcome(s)</i>
Phase 1 Actual	
Phase 2 (FY 02) Target	
Phase 2 Actual	
Phase 3 (FY 03) Target	
Phase 3 Actual	

The full set of GKG outcomes, indicators, targets, and timeline is presented in Annex B.

2.2 Discussion of the “Engagement Index”

A large portion of the GKG initiative’s activities relate specifically to the strengthening of institutions and their active and full participation in the activities of the project, most importantly those of cross-border cooperation. Institutional strengthening activities are notably difficult to implement, conditional on the independent motivation of multiple partners, and even harder to monitor and measure. This is complicated by the initiative’s short timeframe.

Phrases such as “increased interstate collaboration” or “increased organizational capacity” usually require a two-step approach of a pre-evaluation and a post-, or follow-up, evaluation to characterize and quantify those increases or improvements. That facility is not available to the GKG project due to both the time constraint and the streamlined design to work rapidly in a limited facilitative fashion with a small team. However, the GKG staff is sensitive to the needs to establish clear, consistent and viable outcomes for its activity package. The review of the proposed PMP with the Aurora IMPACT team has helped to do this.

One particular measurement established for the IR characterized by the strongest institutional strengthening elements (IR 12.3 - Organizations and institutions capable of effective regional intervention) involves the development of an “engagement or effectiveness” index. The AURORA IMPACT team reports previous use of and experience with an effectiveness index in the

CBNRM/TBNRM sector. In fact, contributions to developing functional indices of engagement and effectiveness includes some of the previous RCSA work in TBNRM.

In the context of the GKG initiative, the index will track the participation and support received from the key national agencies, sub-regional institutions and local organizations (where appropriate) in the elaboration and launching of the critical agreements, protocols and structure. Key activities to chart within the index might include:

- Enactment of the TFCA treaty (IR12.2)
- Implementation of common guidelines for existing protocols (IR12.2)
- Establishment of the Joint Management Board (assumed by project)
- Completion of natural resources-based economic development program (IR 12.1)
- Participation in the Tri-national Joint Community Committee (IR12.1)
- Effective Ministerial Committee (under RCSA, on-going)

These are illustrative activities. The GKG staff will continue to work with the RCSA SO team and the IMPACT project to refine this index and develop an objective and useful scoring system that indicates, with some degree of confidence, the improvements within the partner institutions.

2.3 Explanation of Annex C – Strategic Refocusing Matrix

Conversations with the RCSA SO Team and the Mission Director, showed, even with the approval of the Supplemental Work Plan, a tangible concern for the combination of tight time frame, aggressive targets and a streamlined project team. This concern expressed itself with an invitation for the GKG staff to work with the SO team in the coming months to review progress with the potential aim of prioritizing the activity targets. The term “strategic refocusing” was applied to this process.

Annex C illustrates one potential framework for this exercise. It includes the full listing of planned activities. Against these, it proposes five key characteristics related to the implementation and completion of any one of these activities. They are:

1. Urgency – the estimated need for prompt activity completion as viewed by the project staff, project partners or the client.
2. Sequential Need – the estimated need (priority) that a particular activity be completed before another that requires the first as an obvious foundation or an eventual input.
3. Comparative Advantage – Is the project meeting a very specific need not likely to be met by other projects, partners or donors?
4. Uniform Need – Is the activity serving the widest audience and helping the most partners, or is it to achieve a specific and more limited objective?
5. Probability of Success – Can the activity realistically be achieved with the projects limited resources, within its range of experience and capacity and with the full support of its partners?

The Annex includes a proposed scoring system for evaluating and ranking of these activities. While only one potential approach, it would provide the GKG and SO teams a convenient way to develop a relative priority listing of project activities. The eventual need to conduct this evaluation will be determined by the ongoing progress of the initiative.

2.4 Reporting

As indicated in the Tables of Indicators and Targets, the GKG staff intends to report quarterly on the progress of its program across the full spectrum of activities. These reports will adhere strictly to the structure and outline of this performance monitoring plan, once approved. The quarterly reports will represent in summary form these same tables. The narrative of the report will provide details and text for the specific quarter’s work

ANNEX A: GKG RESULTS FRAMEWORK

ANNEX B: GKG TABLES OF INDICATORS AND TARGETS

TABLE 1: IR 12.1 INDICATORS

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 12.1 Viable practices for sustainable management of shared natural resources adopted					
	Overall Impact	<u>Sub-Result A: Increased Interstate Collaboration in Protected Areas Management</u>	<u>Sub-Result B: Increased Interstate Collaboration in Community Economic Development</u>	<u>Sub-Result C: Increased Community participation in Natural Resource- based Enterprises</u>	<u>Sub-Result D: Improved Natural Resources management planning</u>
Performance Indicator	Specific instruments developed for national and sub-regional agencies, local organizations and communities to cooperate effectively in NRM in the TFCA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A joint management plan (JMP developed for the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP) 2. Coordination with Integrated Regional Tourism Plan (IRTP) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tri-National Joint Community Committee (TNJCC) produces formal articulation of community needs (agenda) v-a-v economic development of TFCA 2. Coordination with development of eventual TFCA master plan 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Community socio-economic profile baseline completed 2. Commercial joint ventures formulated 3. NR-based community economic development programs designed 4. Community NR Enterprise Lessons Analyzed, Reported, Disseminated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bahine NP MP 2. Zinave NP MP 3. Sengwe Corridor MP 4. TFCA component management plans (e.g., Mapulanguene, K2C, Chicualacuala)
Indicator Definition	Completion of collaborative structures, local ventures, local grant programs for enterprise, and specific TFCA MPs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Completed plan for the GLTP 2. IRTP elements incorporated into the JMP 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. AGENDA produced 2. AGENDA incorporated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Survey completed 2. Joint ventures 3. NGO grant(s) 4. Analysis completed 	MPs developed, submitted and approved
Unit of Measurement		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. JMP produced 2. JMP includes key IRTP elements 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agenda 2. Master Plan w/AGENDA 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report 2. Joint ventures proposed 3. Viable enterprise(s) 4. Report 	MP(s)
Data Source		GKG	GKG	GRG	GKG
Method/Approach of Data Collection		Review of reports	Review of reports	Review of reports	Completed MPs
Schedule/Frequency		Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Reporting		Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
End-users		Joint Management Board, Ministerial Comm.	TNJCC, TFCA	NGOs, commercial enterprises, GKG partners	National Parks, TFCA

TABLE 2: IR 12.1 TARGETS

Targeted Result	Overall Impact	<u>Sub-Result A: Increased Interstate Collaboration in Protected Areas Management</u>	<u>Sub-Result B: Increased Interstate Collaboration in Community Economic Development</u>	<u>Sub-Result C: Increased Community participation in Natural Resource based Enterprises</u>	<u>Sub-Result D: Improved Natural Resources management planning</u>
IR 12.1 Viable practices for sustainable management of shared natural resources adopted		1. A joint management plan (JMP developed for the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP)) 2. Coordination with Integrated Regional Tourism Plan (IRTP)	1. Tri-National Joint Community Committee (TNJCC) produces formal articulation of community needs (agenda) v-a-v economic development of TFCA 2. Coordination with development of eventual TFCA master plan	1. Community socio-economic profile baseline completed 2. Commercial joint ventures formulated 3. NR-based community economic development programs designed 4. Community NR Enterprise Lessons Analyzed, Reported, Disseminated	1. Bahine NP MP 2. Zinave NP MP 3. Sengwe Corridor MP 4. TFCA component management plans (e.g., Mapulanguene, K2C, Chicualacuala)
Target		1 JMP finalized with IRTP elements	1. 1 agenda 2. 1 master plan	1. 1 survey/report 2. 3 commercial accords concluded 3. 3 grants/9 enterprises 4. 1 analysis report	Total of 3 MPs
Baseline Data (@ start of contract)		JMP non-existent	0	From existing reports and documents from partners and regional organizations	MPs non-existent
Phase 1 (FY 01) Target		-----	0	0	0
Phase 1 Actual		-----	0	0	0
Phase 2 (FY 02) Target		Drafted/Approved	1. 1 2. 0	1. 1 2. 2 3. 3/0 4. 0	1
Phase 2 Actual					
		-----	1. 0 2. 1	1. 0	2

Phase 3 (FY 03)Target				2. 1 3. 0/9 4. 1	
Phase 3 Actual		-----			

TABLE 3: IR12.2 INDICATORS

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 12.2: Policies, protocols and agreements enacted to support TBNRM				
	Overall Impact	Sub-Result A: Improved Policy Environment for Management of Shared Resources	Sub-Result B: Broader Stakeholder Participation in NRM Policy Decision-Making	Sub-Result C: Treaty establishing TFCA drafted
Performance Indicator	Policies, Protocols and Agreements regarding TBNRM adopted and implemented	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National and Regional Review of NRM Policies 2. Operational NRM policy harmonization 3. Issue guidelines for implementing regional protocols 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify policy impediments to stakeholder participation 2. Increased advocacy for TBNRM initiatives among decision makers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus definition of TFCA boundaries 2. Treaty drafted and formally submitted
Indicator Definition	Formal inter-state agreements adopted by ministerial coordinating committee and the national agencies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Macro-level formal review of the national & regional policies 2. New common policies established for: a) fencing, b) revenue and cost allocation, c) wildlife management, d) CBNRM support framework 3. Produce common guidelines for implementation of Reg. Protocol 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participatory review of common policy & regulatory impediments 2. TBNRM champions identified and nurtured 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Governments work and propose jointly agreed to TFCA boundaries 2. Ministerial committee produces and submits draft treaty
Unit of Measurement		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report completed/circulated 2. Policies Drafted and submitted 3. Guidelines formulated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report(s) 2. Key decision-makers 	Treaty
Data Source		GKG and Partners	GKG and Partners	Ministerial meeting minutes and reports
Method/Approach of Data Collection		Review of records	Review of Records	Direct communication(s)
Schedule/Frequency		Quarterly	Quarterly	Once only (near completion)
Reporting		Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly progress updates Upon Formulation / Final Report
End-users		National agencies	National Parliaments and agencies, extra-governmental stakeholders	Ministers and TFCA

TABLE 4: IR12.2 TARGETS

Targeted Result	Overall Impact	Sub-Result A: Improved Policy Environment for Management of Shared Resources	Sub-Result B: Broader Stakeholder Participation in NRM Policy Decision-Making	Sub-Result C: Treaty establishing TFCA drafted
INTERMEDIATE RESULT 12.2: Policies, protocols and agreements enacted to support TBNRM	Policies, Protocols and Agreements regarding TBNRM discussed, proposed and adopted	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. National and Regional Review of NRM Policies 2. Operational NRM policy harmonization 3. Operationalize regional protocols 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify policy impediments to stakeholder participation 2. Increased awareness for TBNRM initiatives among decision makers 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus definition of TFCA boundaries 2. Treaty drafted and formally submitted
Target	5 revised or new policies, protocols or agreements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. one formal review completed, report circulated 2. 4 high priority areas (above) have accepted common policies 3. 3 guidelines issued 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Final Report 2. Champions selected (roster established) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consensus on boundaries 2. FCA treaty drafted
Baseline Data (@ start of contract)		Existing information and policies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Existing information 2. Existing information 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Treaty non-existent 2. Treaty non-existent
Phase 1 (FY 01) Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 0 3. 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. 0 	0
Phase 1 Actual				
Phase 2 (FY 02)Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. 2 3. 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 of 3 countries 2. 0
Phase 2 Actual				
Phase 3 (FY 03)Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. 2 3. 3 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. roster produced and employed 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. third country 2. treaty
Phase 3 Actual				

TABLE 5: IR 12.3 INDICATORS

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 12.3: Organizations and institutions capable of effective regional intervention				
	Overall Impact	<u>Sub-Result A</u> : Increased subregional capacity to engage in TBNRM	<u>Sub-Result B</u> : Local organizational capacity increased to provide TBNRM services	<u>Sub-Result C</u> : institutional frameworks for TBNRM collaboration clarified
Indicator	National and sub-regional agencies assess internal systems and external coordinating structures for managing TFCA efforts and make improvements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessments of the 3 national implementing agencies 2. Development of long term Institutional strengthening plans 3. National agencies engage in TBNRM implementation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provincial/local govt. capacity assessed, needs identified 2. Extra-governmental capacity assessed, needs identified 3. Roles & responsibilities of local involvement articulated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic planning for DNAC and MiTur provided 2. Inter- & intra-governmental structures and mechanisms developed for GLTP/JMB 3. xtra-governmental structures and mechanisms developed for GLTP/JMB
Indicator Definition	Completed plans to strengthen internal systems and mutual agreements to collaborate on TFCA management	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed reports submitted to agencies 2. strategic plans developed 3. Full engagement or commitment (to activities) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed reports 2. completed reports 3. Similar engagement of extra-governmental institutions (with TFCA activities) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. action plan completed 2. Roles and responsibilities articulated 3. Proposed structure and mechanisms produced
Unit of Measurement	Common "Engagement or Effectiveness" Index ----- --→	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed reports 2. completed plans 3. Index 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. completed reports 2. completed plans 3. Index 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. complete action plans 2. draft framework for JMB 3. Index
Data Source		GKG and partners, documents	GKG and partners, documents	GKG and partners, documents
Method of Data Collection		Review of reports/docs/minutes	Review of reports/docs/minutes	Review of reports/docs/minutes
Frequency		Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
Reporting		Quarterly	Quarterly	Quarterly
End-users		National agencies	Provincial level partners	National and local level agencies

TABLE 6: IR12.3 TARGETS

Targeted Result	Overall Impact	Sub-Result A: Increased subregional capacity to engage in TBNRM	Sub-Result B: Local organizational capacity increased to provide TBNRM services	Sub-Result C: Clarify institutional frameworks for TBNRM collaboration
IR 12.3 Organizations and institutions capable of effective regional intervention		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Assessments of the 3 national implementing agencies 2. Development of long term Institutional strengthening plans 3. National agencies engage in TBNRM implementation 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provincial/local govt. capacity assessed, needs identified 2. Extra-governmental capacity assessed, needs identified 3. Roles & responsibilities of local involvement articulated 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strategic planning for DNAC and MiTur provided 2. Inter- & intra-governmental structures and mechanisms developed for GLTP/JMB 3. Extra-governmental structures and mechanisms developed for GLTP/JMB
Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 2. 2 3. score = _____ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 1 3. score = _____ 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. ?? 3. score = _____
Baseline Data (@ start of contract)		Non-existent	Non-existent	
Phase 1 (FY 01) Target				
Phase 1 Actual				
Phase 2 (FY 02)Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 2. 0 3. 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. 1 3. 0 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 1 2. ?? 3. 0
Phase 2 Actual				
Phase 3 (FY 03)Target		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. 2 3. index tallied and scored 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2 2. 3 3. index tallied and scored 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 0 2. 0 3. index tallied and scored
Phase 3 Actual				

TABLE 7: IR12.4 INDICATORS

Intermediate Result 12.4 Ecological monitoring systems improved for NRM decisions				
	Overall Impact	Sub-Result A: Improved Lead Agency monitoring systems	Sub-Result B: Joint Management Board monitoring system developed	Sub-Result C: Voluntary TFCA monitoring system developed for Private sector
Performance Indicator	Ecological monitoring systems studied and reviewed across TFCA, improved systems developed	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Current agency monitoring systems assessments Create common data exchange protocol 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Assist JMB identify GLTP indicators Assist JMB design a GLTP monitoring system 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis of current grading systems community and stakeholders identify key indicators Green seal testing (certification systems)
Indicator Definition	Promulgation/adoption of common ecological monitoring instruments and mechanisms within TFCA, by TFCA bodies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Agency systems reviewed and analyzed Minimum common protocol formulated 	1 & 2. JMB endorses a common monitoring system	For all three: a greater TFCA “brand” and set of standards of operation endorsed
Unit of Measurement		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> assessment reports data protocol 	System designed	A concept paper
Data Source		GKG and partners, documents	GKG and partners, documents	GKG and partners, documents
Method/Approach of Data Collection		Report	Report	Report
Schedule/Frequency		Quarterly	Quarterly	End of project
Reporting		Quarterly	Quarterly	End of project
End-users		National agencies	JMB	TFCA partners

TABLE 8: IR 12.4 TARGETS

Targeted Result	Overall Impact	<u>Sub-Result A: Improved Lead Agency monitoring systems</u>	<u>Sub-Result B: JMB monitoring system developed</u>	<u>Sub-Result C: Develop voluntary TFCA monitoring system</u>
IR 12.4 Ecological monitoring systems improved for NRM decisions		1. Current agency monitoring systems assessments 2. Create common data exchange Protocol	1. Assist JMB identify GLTP indicators 2. Assist JMB design a GLTP monitoring system	1. Analysis of current grading systems 2. community and stakeholders identify key indicators 3. Green seal testing (certification systems)
Target		1. 3 2. 1 protocol	1. 1 2. 1	One concept paper
Baseline Data (@ start of contract)		From agencies	Non-existent	Non-existent
Phase 1 (FY 01) Target				
Phase 1 Actual				
Phase 2 (FY 02)Target		1. 3 2. 0	1. 0 2. 0	
Phase 2 Actual				
Phase 3 (FY 03)Target		1. 0 2. 1	1. 1 2. 1	1
Phase 3 Actual				

**ANNEX C: PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN STRATEGIC
REFOCUSING MATRIX**

STRATEGIC REFOCUSING MATRIX

Concept:

The ensemble of activities planned for the GKG project and approved in the Supplemental Work Plan are listed in the Matrix that follows. The columns to the right indicate the relative score for each activity against the five proposed characteristics intrinsic to any project activity. The total scores can then be used to indicate an approximate relative ranking among all of the proposed tasks. This will provide the project managers with a tool for identifying the most likely successful or most important activities should there be an eventual need to evaluate them in this way.

Key Activity Characteristics:

Urgency – the estimated need for prompt activity completion as viewed by the project staff, project partners or the client.

Sequential Need – the estimated need (priority) that a particular activity be completed before another that requires the first as an obvious foundation or an eventual input.

Comparative Advantage – Is the project meeting a very specific need not likely to be met by other projects, partners or donors?

Uniform Need – Is the activity serving the widest audience and helping the most partners, or is it to achieve a specific and more limited objective?

Probability of Success – Can the activity realistically be achieved with the projects limited resources, within its range of experience and capacity and with the full support of its partners?

Scoring:

It is proposed that the scoring be as simple and straightforward as possible. In this case, a four-point arrangement can be applied:

- 1 point – not time sensitive, low priority, not likely, little need, no capacity or advantage
- 2 points – slightly more so than the above
- 3 points – decidedly urgent, high priority, great advantage or capacity, wide need
- 4 points – significantly more so than the above

This scoring would provide a range from 0 to 20 (theoretical high) for any one of the activities. This should be quite adequate for showing relative positions across the entire set of activities. Should more sensitivity be required, the evaluators could employ a point range from with more values.

The scoring assumes that there is no weighting across the 5 different characteristics. The evaluators may assign more weight to a preferred characteristic by raising the point range (to 5 or 10 points max – a multiplier) if there is an eventual determination that highlights one or more is required. Scoring could be compared “down” any single column to make comparisons within only that characteristic.

Evaluation:

The scoring and evaluation would be conducted jointly between the key project staff and the USAID RCSEA mission cognizant technical staff.

Strategic Refocusing Matrix		1	2	3	4	5	Total
IR 12.1 Viable practices for sustainable mngt. of shared NR adopted							
a)	Increased Interstate Collaboration in Protected Areas Management						
	- Joint Management Plan developed for GLTP						
	- Coordination with integrated regional tourism plan						
b)	Increased Interstate Collaboration in Community Economic Develop.						
	- TNJCC produces formal articulation of community needs						
	- Coordination with TFCA master plan						
c)	Increased Community participation in NR-based Enterprises						
	- Community socio-economic profile baseline established						
	- Commercial joint ventures supported						
	- NR-based community economic development supported						
	- Comm. NR Enterprise Lessons/Analyzed/Reported/Disseminated						
d)	Improved natural resources management planning						
	- Banhine NP management plan						
	- Zinave NP management plan						
	- Sengwe Corridor boundary definition and management plan						
	- TFCA component management plans developed						
	Mapulanguene						
	K2C Biosphere Reserve						
	Chicualacuala District						
IR 12.2 Policies, protocols, agreements enacted to support TBNRM							
a)	Improved Policy Environment for Mangt. of Shared Resources						
	- National and Regional Review of NRM Policies						
	- Operational NRM policy harmonization						
	Fencing						
	Revenue forest allocation						
	Wildlife management						
	CBNRM support framework						
	- Issue guidelines for implementing regional protocols						
b)	Broader Stakeholder Participation in NRM Policy Decision-Making						
	- Identify policy impediments to stakeholder participation						
	- Increased advocacy for TBNRM initiatives among decision-makers						
c)	Treaty establishing TFCA drafted						
	- Consensus on boundaries						
	- Treaty Drafted						
IR 12.3 Orgs. and institutions capable of effective regional intervention							
a)	Increased sub regional capacity to engage in TBNRM						
	- Assessments of the 3 national implementing agencies						
	- Development of long-term Institutional Strengthening plans						
	- National agencies engage in TBNRM implementation						
b)	Local organizational capacity increased to provide TBNRM services						
	- Provincial/local govt. capacity assessed, needs identified						
	- Extra-governmental capacity assessed, needs identified						
	- Roles/Responsibilities of local involvement articulated						
c)	Institutional frameworks for TBNRM collaboration clarified						
	- Strategic planning for DNAC and MiTur provided						
	- Inter/intra-governntl. structures and mechanisms developd. for GLTP						
	- Extra-governntl. structures and mechanisms develop. For GLTP						
IR 12.4 Ecological monitoring systems for improved NRM decisions							
a)	Improved Lead Agency monitoring systems						
	- Current agency monitoring systems assessments						
	- Appropriate interventions to improve systems facilitated						
b)	Joint Management Board monitoring system developed						
	- Assist JMB identify GLTP indicators						
	- Assist JMB design GLTP monitoring system						
c)	Voluntary TFCA monitoring system developed for private sector						
	- Analysis of current grading systems						
	- Community & stakeholders identify key indicators						

- Green seal testing						
----------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--